REMARKS

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a system that stores a font capabilities list for a client device, receives an electronic data transfer addressed to one of the devices, and compares font data of the electronic data transfer to the font capabilities list of that device to determine augment font data.

This is not disclosed by the cited reference to Mori. Mori's host terminal assigns fonts to text characters based on "frequency of appearance" – not based on individual client devices' capabilities as claimed. Mori's host terminal does not even **have** a stored font capabilities list for a client device as claimed (as the Office Action notes at the end of pg. 2), much less determine augment font data from such lists as claimed. The Examiner contends (top of p. 3 of Office Action) that "[t]he motivation to do so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device." However, the skilled person would not have considered implementing all the aforementioned capabilities (storing font capability lists, comparing them, and determining augment font data from them) in the absence of any suggestion from the prior art. In fact, the skilled person would have been dissuaded from doing so by the increased procedural complexity and hardware demands that the he/she would assume to be required, especially in the absence of any suggestion from the prior art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 recites method steps that include storing a font capabilities list associated with a client device, and comparing the list to font data of an electronic data transfer to identify augment font data.

This is not disclosed by the cited reference to Mori. Mori's host terminal assigns fonts to text characters based on "frequency of appearance" – not based on individual client devices' capabilities as claimed. In fact, Mori's host terminal lacks the claimed step of storing a font capabilities list for a client device, and further lacks the claimed step of comparing the list to font data of a data transfer to identify augment font data. The Examiner contends (top of p. 3 of Office Action) that "[t]he motivation to do so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device." However, the skilled person would not have considered implementing all the above claim steps in the absence of

any suggestion from the prior art. In fact, the skilled person would have been dissuaded from doing so by the increased procedural complexity and hardware demands that the he/she would assume to be required, especially in the absence of any suggestion from the prior art. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 recites means for accessing font data in an electronic data transfer addressed to a client device. Claim 18 is similar to claim 10 in that the font data is compared to a font capabilities list associated with the client device to identify augment font data. Claim 18 is thus patentable over the cited references for the reasons explained for claim 10.

Independent Claim 19

Claim 19 recites method steps similar to those of claim 10. The steps include determining client font capabilities associated with a client device, and comparing the font capabilities to font data of an electronic message to identify augment font data. Claim 19 is thus patentable over the cited references for the reasons explained for claim 10.

New Independent Claim 24

Claim 24 recites the method steps of storing a font capabilities list for each of multiple client devices, receiving text data addressed to a designated one of the devices, comparing font identifiers in the text data with the fonts in the capabilities list of the designated device to determine which required font structure data the designated device lacks.

This is not suggested by the prior art of record. The Mori reference, in particular, lacks the claimed storing, comparing and determining steps. Therefore, claim 24 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-17, 20-21 and 25-28

The remaining claims depend from base claims that are patentable over the prior art as explained above. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish them further form the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims also are patentable.

For example, claim 25 includes the added limitation that the client device permanently stores the received font structure data. Mori teaches away from this limitation in his statement "Thus, the small font set stored selected by analyzer 204 changes or adapts to the specific content that is requested by terminal 202." [0037]

Similarly in claim 26, the server receives the text data along with attendant font structure data required to render the text data, but refrains from transferring the attendant font structure data to the device in response to determining that the device already has the attendant font structure data. This limitation, too, is not suggested by the references.

Similarly, claim 27 adds a limitation not suggested by the references, that the server requests and receives the lacking font structure data from a third party server. Similarly, claim 28 adds a limitation not suggested by the references, that the server determines whether any of the font identifiers in the received text data have equivalent counterparts that are found in the client device's font capabilities list.

The application is therefore now be in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose, (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 4/20/07